

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-5 and 11-29 are present in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 28 and 29 have been amended, and claims 6-9 have been canceled. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

At the outset, Applicants extend their appreciation to Examiner Corrielus for his courtesy in conducting the interview with Applicants' representative on August 4, 2005. The contents of the interview are summarized in the following remarks.

Initially, Applicants respectfully submit that the finality of the May 20, 2005 Office Action is premature and should be withdrawn. On page 11, the Office Action contends that Applicants' Amendment filed December 22, 2004 "necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office Action." Consequently, this Action is made final. As discussed during the interview, however, the amendments to the claims in the Amendment filed December 22, 2004 did not present any subject matter not previously considered by the Examiner. In particular, claims 1, 28 and 29 were amended to include the subject matter of claim 10. Additionally, claims 13 and 15 were redrafted in independent form.

Additionally, on page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner acknowledges that "Johnson does not explicitly disclose the use of posting the scientific poster image on an internet web page." On page 5 of the Office Action, however, the Examiner contends that Johnson discloses such subject matter with regard to claim 10, which as noted was canceled in the previous Amendment. The Office Action further contends that the subject matter of claims 11 and 12 is disclosed in Johnson, but this subject matter relates to the posting of the scientific poster image on an internet web page, which subject matter was acknowledged as lacking in the Johnson patent on page 3 of the Office Action.

In view of at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the finality of the May 20, 2005 Office Action is premature. During the interview, Examiner Corrielus agreed to withdraw the finality of this Office Action.

Claims 1-9 and 11-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,493,490 to Johnson in view of an article entitled "A Web-Based System for Assessing and Searching for Designs," authored by Kahn et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Johnson patent generally discloses an electronic system for creating customized product proposals. Users can customize the proposals by selecting various options, and once all options have been selected, a proposal or brochure is printed. The Kahn article discloses a web-based system for profiling designs and for searching for designs with specific characteristics. Without conceding the contentions in the Office Action with regard to claim 1, claim 1 has been amended herein to include the subject matter of claims 6-8. In particular, claim 1 defines a step of storing user-input substantive data in a dedicated vault and uploading the user-input substantive data. The step of building an image of the scientific poster links designated files from the user's dedicated vault, and when one or more of the designated files is modified, the scientific poster image is updated according to the modified files.

In this manner, an electronically displayed scientific poster image posted on an internet web page can be readily updated in the event the user substantive data is modified for one reason or another. An updated electronic display can thus be obtained without the added costs of generating another printed poster.

This subject matter is neither described nor suggested in the Johnson patent particularly since Johnson endeavors to generate a printed copy of a sales brochure or the like based on user-selected input. As such, Johnson has no ability to link designated files from a dedicated vault to

a generated image or an ability to modify the generated image when one or more of the designated files is modified. Johnson in fact teaches away from any modification to incorporate such subject matter since its express intent is to generate printed product proposals, sales brochures or the like. Kahn does not correct this deficiency as Kahn similarly lacks any teaching or suggestion of a scientific poster image built with links to user-input substantive data stored in a dedicated vault, or when one or more of the designated files is modified, the scientific poster image is updated according to the modified files.

During the interview, Examiner Corrielus understood these distinctions and indicated that he would consider amended claim 1 in view of our discussion.

Claims 28 and 29 have been similarly amended, and Applicants submit that these claims are allowable for reasons similar to those discussed above in connection with claim 1.

Claim 13 defines a method of processing scientific posters over a global network wherein the user is enabled to input drill-down components of the scientific poster, where the drill down components are incorporated into the scientific poster image, and access to the drill down components is enabled through the image. In this context, the Office Action references Johnson at column 9, lines 14-65. As discussed during the interview, the Johnson patent, however, does not in any manner even remotely disclose or suggest an ability to enable access to drill-down components through an image. Indeed, since the Johnson patent discloses the production of a printed brochure, Johnson would not have any ability to access such drill-down component *through the image* as claimed. Kahn does not correct this deficiency, and Applicants submit that the rejection of claim 13 is misplaced.

Claim 14 and independent claim 15 recite that the user is enabled to input dynamic components of the scientific poster and that the dynamic components are incorporated into the

scientific poster, which components are accessible through the image. In this context, the Office Action references Johnson at column 5, lines 5-67 and column 8, lines 15-64. The Johnson patent, however, neither discloses nor suggests the incorporation of dynamic components accessible *through the image* as Johnson endeavors to generate a printed brochure. This distinction was also discussed during the interview, and Examiner Corrielus seemed to appreciate differences between the printed media disclosed in the Johnson patent and the electronic media according to the present invention. Kahn does not correct these deficiencies, and Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 14 and 15 is also misplaced.

Independent claim 21 defines a method of processing scientific posters over a global network that includes, *inter alia*, steps of (c) archiving the scientific posters and cross-referencing related scientific posters, and (d) enabling access to the scientific posters by the global network. As discussed during the interview, the Office Action on page 8 contends that “all the limitations of claim 21 have been mentioned in the rejection of claim 1, except Johnson fails to disclose the use of enabling access to the scientific posters via the global network.” As discussed previously, however, nowhere does the Office Action address the subject matter of step (c), and Applicants in fact submit that this subject matter is lacking in Johnson and Kahn, taken singly or in combination. During the interview, Examiner Corrielus agreed to carefully consider the subject matter of claim 21.

With respect to any of the dependent claims not discussed above, Applicants submit that these claims are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on an allowable independent claim.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.


BURGEL et al.
Appl. No. 09/933,868
August 9, 2005

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are patentable over the art of record and that the application is in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desirable in order to place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Prompt passage to issuance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: 
Alan M. Kagen
Reg. No. 36,178

AMK:jls
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100